

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated August 15, 2007. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly define the printhead modules are unitary components that have a support frame on which the support member and the printhead ICs are attached. The printhead modules are individually mounted and removed from the casing such that the end portions form a fluid connection with the adjacent, linearly aligned, printhead modules.

The support frame 22 and the individual attachment and removal of the printhead modules from the casing 20 are discussed throughout the Detailed Description.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 1 and 5

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected as obvious in light of US application 2002/0180834 to Silverbrook in view of US application 2002/0005878 to Moon.

The Examiner has copied Figure 9 from '834 to Silverbrook into the Office Action to indicate that the printhead circuit board 42 has been equated to the support member of claim 1. The support member is defined as having a longitudinally extending channel for supplying the printhead ICs with printing fluid. Accordingly, we assume that the Examiner has included the eight separate ink reservoir moldings 76 as integers of the support member.

Amended claim 1 has clarified that the printhead modules are unitary components that can be individually installed or removed from the casing. Installation forms a fluid connection with the adjacent printhead modules. A printhead module with multiple ICs and convenient coupling with like modules is a cost effective method of producing a range of printers for a broad variety of printing applications (eg. A4 SOHO to architectural wideformat).

The '834 PCB 20 and ink reservoir moldings 76 together with the printhead modules 46 are not installed and removed as a single unitary component. Therefore, '834 does not disclose modules, as defined by claim 1, which are mounted in linear alignment and fluidly interconnected.

Moon teaches a single printhead IC 102 mounted to a larger support in the printhead. It is silent as to a printhead module with two or more printhead ICs each.

The cited references do not teach all the elements of claim 1 or claim 5. Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of claims 1 or 5.

35 U.S.C. §103 – Claim 2

Claim 2 stands rejected as obvious in light of '834 to Silverbrook and '878 to Moon in view of US 5,658,158 to Milan.

As discussed above, '834 and '878 fail to disclose a module with all the elements and functional capabilities defined by claim 1. The disclosure in Milan also fails to teach or suggest these elements. As claim 2 incorporates these elements by virtue of its indirect dependence from claim 1, it is clear that the citations fail to support a rejection on the basis of §103.

35 U.S.C. §103 – Claim 3 and 4

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected as obvious in light of '834 to Silverbrook and '878 to Moon in view of US 5,658,158 to Milan and US 6,180,002 to Higgins.

As discussed above, '908 and Milan fail to teach or suggest several elements defined in claim 2. The disclosures in Higgins and '834 also fail to teach or suggest these elements. As claims 3 and 4 incorporate these elements by virtue of indirect dependence from claim 2, it is clear that the citations fail to support a rejection on the basis of §103.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook



Norman Micheal Berry



Garry Raymond Jackson



Akira Nakazawa

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762